G R. S. 59]

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

1908.

(Mysr.)

File No. 236-08

Serial Nos. 1 – 11

Papers Filed.

Month Sept 09

SUBJECT.

Panchama-akki Anjaneya Swami
temple in Dodpet, Mysore city.

PREVIOUS REFERENCES.	LATER REFERENCES.
Mng 2 152-03	104 909.

G.R.S. 11] 190 8.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

(Mysore)

NOTES.

File No. 236-08

FILL HEADING.

Sri Sanchamukhi Anjaneyaswamy temple in Doddapet, Mysore city

From

The Dy. Commissioner, Mysore Dist.

No. 149 Dated 24-11-1908 Received 1-12-1908

Diary No. 251 | Enclos. 1 file Spare Copies — | Serial No. 1

BRIEF ABSTRACT OF LETTER.

Solicits orders in the matter of defending the suit filed in the Mysore Dist. judge's court by one Kanvamahadi Srinivasa Iyengar for being placed in possession of S. nos 5,418 of Doddigal village, Channapatna Taluk, recently entered to be Devadaya Inam endowed to Sanchamukhi Anjaneya Swamy.

NOTES AND ORDERS.

In Govt. Sec. no. 3430-1 dated 22 may 1904, it was directed that the Khata of S. nos. 5,418 referred to, be transferred to the name of Sanchamukhi Anjaneyaswamy and the Dy. Commr was asked to submit

NOTES—First sheet

GPB—30,000—3-4-07

Serial No.

a report for having effected the required change. The Dy. Commissioner now reports that the needful entries have been made.

From the copy of the Plans received with the Remanded records,- it is observed that the Plaintiff & the Defendants in this suit are as noted below:—

Plaintiff.	Vs.	Defendants.
Ramanuchari Srinivasiengar		1) Subbachar 2) Ramachar (sons of Venkatarama Ramanuja chari) 3) Taluk Amildar 4) cultivator of the lands.

It is stated that in connection with the execution of a decree in O.S. no 138 (no. 100 of 1885) of 1893 obtained against the late Archak Venkataramanachar by Srinivasiengar, the parties came to an amicable settlement in 1894-5 whereby it was agreed that the 2 S. nos (item no 1 in the Schedule) were given to the Plaintiff and a house in ~~Lashkar~~ Lashkar Mohalla Mysore (item no 2 in the Schedule) should remain in the possession of the 1st two Defdts. The Plaintiff states that in the title-deed,

Note—Contn. sheet.

GPB—50,000—13.5.08

G. R. S. 12]
General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. 234 of 190 8

Serial No.

The lands are noted as Brahmadeya and personal, that he was paying the quit-rent due thereon to Govt, that the 3 Defts (Amildar) without sufficient grounds evicted his entireties from the lands and has allowed the 4th Defts to attend to its cultivation for the benefit of the 1st 2 Defts who have no right to them and that he already issued a notice by way of a petition dt 21-3-1903 to the Amildar but without any effect. He prays that the Court may order the restoration of the lands to him together with such other relief as the court may deem fit. The petition of the march 1903 is not forthcoming in the records.

Submitted for orders. The case is to come off for hearing on 20th January 1909

4/1/09

4/1/09

Where has been the undue delay in submitting the note, and after all the note from the information and knowledge of the case the draft portion

3
10/1/09

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

GPB—50,000—16.5.08

Serial No.	
2	To, The Dy. Commr, Mysore Distt Letter no 610 Dy 12/09. Calls for a memo of the facts of the case together with a copy of the written Statement proposed to be filed and requests that the Distt Court may be moved to grant a long adjournment
3	From, The Dy Commr, Mysore Distt Letter no 49 Dy 27/7/09 Submits further report called for on the subject The Dy Commr has submitted a memo of the facts of the case It is reported that the copy of the written Statement has not yet been received by the Advocate to be engaged. The Case has been adjourned at the request of the Dy Commr to the 11th August 1909 Submitted for orders 4.8.09
4	To, The Inam Supdt No 358 Dy 5.8.09 Calls for the extract of the Inam register From, The Sanad officer, Letter no 17 Dy 7/10.8.09

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

GPB—50 000—18-5-08

Serial No. 5

Submits the Inam extract.

In the extract, the S no. in question is noted as Personal but under Govt order of the 2nd May 1904, it has been changed into Devadaya.

The question for decision in this case is whether S no 418 of Adigal is a personal Inam as contended by Kannambadi Srinivasiengar or a Devadaya Inam as observed by Govt in the above order.

AV 10/8/09 Submitted for orders

Nov 10 Under Secretary

From The Inam lands were granted by the Inam Commissioner's proceedings. The adoption which divided the property in this case that the property should be made out in the name of the Temple has been construed as deciding that the lands are Devadaya and the Inam Register has therefore been altered. When the lands were assigned to Kannambadi Srinivasa Iyengar, the Archaka Mirasdars were named as enjoying in the Inam Register. There is no time to ascertain before what date of Inam for what reasons the lands were entered as Personal at the Inam Settlement. The case comes of the Typographical

Note—Contn. sheet.

GPB—50.000—13.5.08

Serial No.

So far as I can see we cannot defend the case on the merits. The D.C. does nothing about the defence as. The only thing that can be urged is that no Civil Court can be appointed by Govt. as contemplated by the Act against the Amildar and the party has to obtain redress as by petition. ~~We have to defend the Amildar. He must have acted bona fide to the best of his belief.~~ I believe that is the decision in the case of Karve vs Ramanuja Iyengar (Supreme Court Reports).

We have to defend the Amildar who must have acted bona fide to the best of his belief. If this view is approved the D.C. ought to be instructed to send information authorising to defend the suit at Govt. cost.

1602.

The case is somewhat complicated and requires consideration. It may be after all not worth being defended at all. Send a telegram asking Dy C. to get another adjt. for a matter of a month, and call for further information.

Telegram and a D.O. letter despatched yesterday to D.C. Upon a further perusal of the plaint I find that the Amildar is only a pro forma deft. and that the relief sought is only against the

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

GPB—50 000—13-5-08

Serial No.

1611

other drafts. Mr. Chari does not object to the any necessity to defend the suit at Govt. cost.

As promised by the Commissioner Andhra Venkata ramana Chari has now tried to reconcile the previous transactions and the ~~Acting~~ engrg Superintendent of Lands as regards the Dewdrop Inam. The first two drafts are in favour of Venkata-ramana Chari and the fourth draft is the lease of Mr. Pope has given his consent to Venkatarama Chari being made the pattadar provided Mr. Pope Venkatarama Chari

pays the full price to Govt. If Mr. Pope ~~pays~~ the lease has not given to Venkatarama Chari he may now pay to Govt according to the decree

Mr. Chari nothing further so far as the parties are concerned.

Two drafts however are submitted asking for further information from the D.C. and expressing doubt under what circumstances the lands were entered Inam and enfranchised.

1611
14-8-09

Submitted to Board
Commissioner
Ainslie Thumboo

11/8/1909

The drafts may be issued.

18/8/09

Issued
19/8/1909

Note—Contn. sheet.

GPB—50.000—13-5-08

Serial No.	
6.	To, The Dy Commr, Mysore Distt No 531 Dy 19th August 1909. Requests that the District judge may be moved to grant a further adjournment of one month and calls for some additional information on the subject
7.	To, The Inam Supdt No 532 Dy 19th August 1909. Enquires under what circumstances the lands which appear to have been Devadaya Inam granted for the support of the temple were, at the Inam Settlement, treated as personal.
8.	From, The Inam Supdt No. 23 Dy 29th August 1909 Reports on the Subject That officer reports that the Inam appeared in the old accounts of 1831-2 and 1855 in the name of Archak Narasimhachar (Vide cl 14 of the Inam Register), that the land was treated as personal in the Amildar's Statement of Inams 1879 (this has not been received) and that it was accordingly settled as "personal". He adds that under Govt orders, it has since been converted into Devadaya

Note—Contn. sheet.

GPB—50,000—13-5-08

G. R. S. 12]
General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. 236 of 1908

(9

Serial No. 9.

From, The Dy Commr, Mysore Distt
no. 112 Dy 3/9-9-09.
Submits further report.

The Dy Commr reports that the District Judge has been requested to grant a further adjournment of one month, and submits the English memo of Mr Sundararajiengar suggesting the line of defence to be adopted. The Sub Divl officer requests the perusal of Govt orders in re Sri Channigaraya Swamy temple at Hadinaru in this connection. The Dy Commr further reports that Kannambadi Sreenivasiengar's transaction took place in 1895, that in the final title deed of 1898, the lands were treated as Brahmadaya and personal, that in 1904, Govt ordered the conversion into Devadaya, that the land being personal Brahmadaya enfranchised Inam, the Arakak has a right to alienate them and now doubts whether Govt can successfully defend the suit. He adds that if Govt deem it advisable to defend the suit, sanction may be accorded to engage an Advocate.

Submitted for orders
AVJ 11.9.09 W. U 12/9/09

(File Submitted)

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

GPB—50,000—13.5.08

G. R. S. 12]
General and Revenue Secretariat.

Mms File No. 236 of 1906

Serial No.

Note by the Under-Secretary.

Dept.) The Inam Superintendent says that as the Archak's name was found in the accounts and as the list given by the Amildar at the Inam Settlement in 1879 also showed the Archak's name the Inam was registered in his name as "Personal" He adds that in accordance with G.O. no 3430-1 dated 2d May 1906 the Inam was classed as Devadaya in June 1904. I beg to submit that the Govt order referred to cannot be interpreted as altering the class of Inam It having been represented to Govt that the land belonged to the temple and that in accordance with Govt order no. 11741-81 / R 1744 dated 19th Jany 1875 the patta thereof should be in the name of the deity, Govt sanctioned the making out of the patta in the name of the deity. They did not say that the land was Devadaya.

Mr. Sundaravarj Iyengar's memo does not throw any further light on the case. He refers to Hadinaru Temple case which I had looked into before submitting the file. That case

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

GPB—50,000—13.5.08

G. R. S. 12]
General and Revenue Secretariat.

Inward File No. 236 of 1906

Serial No.

is distinguishable. The lands were assessed lands and a suit had to be filed the lands were also valuable In the present case the lands are Inam dry lands whose value may be less than the fee that we may have to pay in the end to an advocate defending the suit Practically it is sought to set aside the Inam Commissioner's order settling the Inam as Personal. A Civil Court is not the proper tribunal to decide this; and it does not appear advisable that Govt should interfere after the lapse of so many years. Reference is invited to Govt order no 1074-6 dated 20th September 1904 in a similar case.

(Flag C)

No decree is asked for against the Amildar who, I believe, is made only a pro-forma defendant. The lessee too will not be affected as he has only to hand over the grain or money to the owner. Govt need not come to the aid of the Archak's son and uphold his repudiation of previous transaction I do not know what the ~~pecuniary~~

(Flag W)

GPB—50,000—18-5 08

G. R. S. 12]
General and Revenue Secretariat.

Mines File No. 236 of 1908

Serial No.

permanent Dy Commissioner would have said; the Acting Dy Comm^r is doubtful of the use of defending the suit at Govt cost. It seems to me that we may say that it is not necessary to defend the suit at Government cost

14/9

Submitted to the Secretary

15/9/09

Say that Govt do not consider it worth their while to defend the suit at Govt Cost.

22/9/09

Asst to Secy

24/9/09

7

24/9/09
Dft Endorsr
22/9/09

Secy
26/9/09

10 To the Dy Comr Mysore Dft No 903 dt 25-12-09
No 7-236-05-10
Says that Govt do not consider it worth their while to defend the suit at Govt cost.

11. From the Dy Comr Mysore Dft No. 125 dt 24-9-09 Solicits orders in the matter of engaging an advocate to defend the suit &c.

GPB—50,000—15-5 08

D257 (1)

~~Judl 87-07~~

1908 Judl F 236-08-1

From
M. Kanakaraj Urs Esq BA
Deputy Commissioner
Mysore District

To
K. S. Chendrasekhara Iyer Esq BA BL.
Secy: to Government
Judicial Branch

Dated 28th November 08

Despatched

Received

General No. 149
No.

Enclosure No. 1 bile

Solicits orders in the matter of defending the suit filed by one Srinivasaiengar, re produce from S. Nos 5 and 418 endowed to the Sri Panchamukhi Anjaneya Swamy temple in Doddanya Pett Mysore city.

(2)

No. 149
Enc. No. 1 file

OFFICE OF THE Deputy Commissioner

MYSORE DISTRICT,

Dated Mysore Camp 28th NOVr 1908.

To
K. S. Chendrasekhara Iyer Esq., B.A. B.L.

SECRETARY TO THE GOVERNMENT
OF HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE,
GENERAL AND REVENUE DEPARTMENTS.
(Inamdari Branch)

Sir,

Adverting to Government Proceedings No. 3430-1 dated 2nd May 1904 directing that the name of the Sri Panchamukhi Anjaneya Swami at Dodda Pete, Mysore city, be entered in the accounts instead of Anjaneya Swami Archak Bhatarwaru, I have the honor to state that the Amildar of the Chamarajnagar Taluk reports that the necessary entries were made 2. The Amildar further reports that he has been made a party in O.S. No. 6 of 1908-09 on the file of the District Judge at Mysore in connection with the suit filed by one Kannambadi Srinivasiengar

for

for the recovery of the produce from the year 1901-1902 from Survey Numbers 5 and 418 situate in Oodigal village Chamarajnagar Taluk, endowed to the Sri Panchamukhi Anjaneya Swami temple at Doddapett, Mysore City and referred to in the Government order quoted above.

3. From the Amildar's report and paras 5, 6 and 7 of the copy of the plaint received therewith, it will be observed that in connection with the execution of a decree obtained against the Archak by the said Srinivasiengar in a separate civil suit, the parties came to an amicable settlement whereby S. Nos 5 and 418 referred to above which were originally Brahmadaya were alienated by the Archak to Srinivasiengar.

4 On a recommendation being made to Government the omission of the name of the Pujari and the insertion

insertion of the name of the deity in the accounts was sanctioned in Govt. Procp: No. 3430-1 dated 2.5.1904.

5. The Amildar solicits instructions as to whether he should attend the court in person on the date of hearing which was fixed for the 25th of November 1908.

6. The District-judge who was requested to kindly adjourn the case has replied that the case would be adjourned to the 20th January 1909.

7. As the case has to be defended in the interests of the temple, I solicit the favour of early orders in the matter.

8. The file of vernacular papers received with the Amildar's report No. 158/261 dated 16.11.08 is herewith submitted for reference

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
your most obedient
servant

Deputy Commissioner
Mysore District.

Urgent (7)
219

Mog 236-08-3

From
M. Kantaraj Urs Esq BA.
Deputy Commissioner
Mysore District

To
K. S. Chandrasekhara Aiyar Esq BA. BL.
Secy: to Govt Revenue Branch

Dated 27th July 1909.

Despatched

Received 4 Aug

General No.

No.

Enclosure No one + file

Submits further report re Inam lands of the Panchamukh Anjaneya Swami Temple at Vadiah Mysore.

insertion of the name of the deity in the accounts was sanctioned in Govt. Progs No. 3430-1 dated 2.5.1904.

5. The Amildar solicits instructions as to whether he should attend the court in person on the date of hearing which was fixed for the 25th of November 1908.

6. The District-judge who was requested to kindly adjourn the case has replied that the case would be adjourned to the 20th January 1909.

7. As the case has to be defended in the interests of the temple, I solicit the favour of early orders in the matter.

8. The file of vernacular papers received with the Amildar's report No. 158/261 dated 16.11.08 is herewith submitted for reference

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
your most obedient
servant

Deputy Commissioner
Mysore District

B.A.

5

C/No 610 D/12.1.1909.

To.

The Deputy Commissioner
Mysore District.

Sir,

In returning herewith the records relating to the inam lands of the Panchamukhi Anjaneya Swami temple at Doddpet, Mysore City, received with your letter No 149 Dated 28th November 1908 I am directed to call for a memo of the facts of the case with a copy of the written statement proposed to be filed.

The lands of which it is said, were originally classed as Brahmadaya. Upon a recommendation made by your Government in their order No 3430-1 D/ 21st May 1904 directed that the Patta should be made out in the name of the Institution. The records of this office do not show that the nature of the inam was altered or that any order under the alienation rules of 1877 was passed for the restoration of the lands to the Institution

6

Case appears to be a complicated one and the main Settlement records have to be connected before Government can pass final orders In these circumstances, I am to request that the District Court may be moved to grant a long adjournment

I have &c

C.
10.1.Aug.

for Secretary

Urgent (7)
219

Mog 236-08-3

From
M. Kanakaraj Urs Esq B.A.
Deputy Commissioner
Mysore District

To
K. S. Chendrasekhara Iyer Esq B.A. B.L.
Secy: to Govt. Inam Branch

Dated 27th July 1909.

Despatched

Received

General No. 4 Cr

No.

Enclosure No one + file

Submits further report re Inam lands of the Panchamukhi Anjaneya Swami temple at Doddeh, Mysore.

Reply
AV
15
28/7/09
AE

No. 49
Enc. No. 1 & 1 bill

OFFICE OF THE Deputy Commr

MYSORE DISTRICT,

Dated Mysore Camp 27th July 1909.

To

K. S. Chendraoekhara Iyer Esq., B.A. B.L.

SECRETARY TO THE GOVERNMENT
OF HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE,
GENERAL AND REVENUE DEPARTMENTS.
Inamsai Branch.

Sir,

Adverting to your letter no: 610 Inam 236-08-2 dated 12th January 1909 regarding the Inam lands of the Pancha Mukhi Anjaneya Swami temple at Dodapet, Nugore, I have the honor to submit herewith the records received with report No. 32/62 dated 25th July 1909 from the Amildar of the Chamarajnagar Taluk together with a memo of the facts of the case.

The copy of the written statement proposed to be filed has not been submitted as the same has yet to be drawn by the Advocate to be engaged.

As requested in this office

the

The case was adjourned to 24th March 1909 by the Dis-
-trict judge and in his doc
-ket no. 3325/775 dated 12th June
1909 the District judge inform
-ed me that the case was de-
creed exparte.

The Public Prosecutor, Mysore Division, was therefore request
-ed in this office letter no 1 dated
2.7.09 to file an application
on behalf of the Amildar Chama
-rajnagar Taluk to set aside
the exparte decree, and in
reply he states in his letter No
179 dated 10.7.1909 that the ex-
parte decree has been set aside
and the case adjourned to the
11th August 1909 for the Govern
-ment to file their answer
to the suit. He further states
that in adjourning the case
the Court has stated as follows:-

" It would appear that the
Deputy Commissioner has
not-

not received instructions from the Government. one more opportunity is given and a month's time is granted."

I therefore solicit the favour of very early instructions.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
your most obedient servant

S Broadbent
for Deputy Commissioner
Mysore District

B.A.

Mvz. 1 a]

From

To The Superintendent of Inam Settlement.

Dated

Despatched

Received

General No.

No.

Enclosure No.

Has the honour to request that a copy of the Register of enquiry relating to the grant of Inam in Udigal village, ~~Hagg~~ Nyyamballi Hobli, Chamarajnagar, to Venkata-ramanappa, Archak of the Panchamukhi Anjaneyaswamy temple in Dodpet, Mysore may be forwarded as it is urgently required for reference.

By order

GPB—8,000—21-7-03

D.324

File no. 236-08-

1909-10 12

From

The Superintendent of Inam Settlements in Mysore

To The Secretary to the Govt of Mysore, General & Revenue Department

Dated 7th
Despatched } August 1909
Received

General No. 17
No. ..

Enclosure No. One

Forwards a copy of the Inam Register relating to the grant of Inam in Nidigal Village, Chamarajanagar Taluk, to Venkatramanachar Archak of the Panchamukha Anjaneyaswami temple at Mysore. ———

Rept. at-one
3/1

A/ 10/8/09

Inam Superintendent's Office
Dated, Bangalore 7th August 1909

No. 17
Que one
From

13

The Superintendent of Inam
Settlements in Mysore

To

The Secretary to the Government
of Mysore, General and Revenue
Departments.

Sir,

With reference to your docket No. 358 M.7.236-08 dated 5th August 1909, I have the honor to forward herewith, a copy of the Inam Register relating to the grant of Inam in Udigal village, Chamarajanagar Taluk, to Venkatramanachar, Archak of the — Panchamukhi Anjaneyaswami temple in Dodpet, Mysore.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient Servant

D. Ramachar
Superintendent of Inam
Settlements in Mysore

Register Sheet No. 41.

Taluk. Chamarajanagar.

Hobli - Yaryamballi.

Village - Yadigalu.

Copy of the

Register of Inams in the village of Vudigala in the

CLASS, EXTENT AND VALUE OF INAM

Number of case or entire holding under one grant in this village	General class to which the Inam belongs	Survey No. and name of field or fields comprised in the grant. Dry, wet or garden	Extent	
			Local measure. Even where the local measure is in acres, guntas, and annas, it is to be entered in this column	Measure in acres and their fractions in decimals
1	2	3	4	5
			Honzur jari Inam account 1831	
1	Devadaya			
	~~Personal~~ Dry	No.	K. K. P	
	Instl of J. P. Grant	263	4 – 18 – 4	
	Smt	311		

Final Quit Rent Register I No 201

Title Deed No 59759
Date of Pattam 1-12-80
Date of issue
To Taluk } — " —

Fresh Title Deed bearing the name of Devadoo issued instead dated 23-7-904.

14

Sammat of Vinjamballi in the Taluk of Chamarajnagara

		DESCRIPTION, TENURE AND	
Old assessment	Survey assessment	Description of Inam	
Where no survey has been made and no assessment fixed by Government, the cess paid by the raiyats to the Inamdar, or the average assessment of similar Government land, should be entered in column 7		If for service, it is to be stated whether the service is continued. If for tanks, buildings, etc., whether they are efficiently kept up Hereditary or for life	Whether free of tax, etc. or liable to quit-rent, *i. e.*, jodi, etc., amount of latter to be entered
6	7	8	9
Beriz P. F. V. Rs. a. P 2-4-" 6-15-8		For ~~personal benefit~~ benefit of The Support of the Panchamukhi of Anjaneyaswami at Doddapet, Mysore city Trustee J. P. Grant Supt.	Free.

DOCUMENTS in support of the claim

By whom granted; and in what year	Written instrument in support of the claim, such as deed, [illegible] document, and other proofs of boundaries
	In this column it should be stated whether a [illegible] grant, whether the grant is produced or lost, and the general [illegible] terms of all documents produced should be stated

15

NAME AND RELATIONSHIP OF ORIGINAL GRANTEE AND

Name of original grantee	Name entered in the register prepared by Poornah up to 1810	Name entered in the accounts subsequent to 1810
12	13	14
		Nuzur Inam account 1831-32. Mysore Panchamukhi Devaroo Archik Narasimhachar K. K. P. D. V Dry 4-18-4 2-4-4
do	do	Do. 1855 Panchamukhi Narasimhachar K. K. P. D. V Dry 4-18-4 2-4-4

of the

OF SUBSEQUENT AND PRESENT HOLDERS

Particulars regarding present owner. If the inam has been subdivided, the name, etc., of each sharer should be entered in the columns			
Residence, name and age, etc.	Relation to original grantee or subsequent registered holders	Surviving heirs of the present incumbent	If unconnected with the original holders, possession how obtained, and in what year
15	16	17	18
Mysore ~~Venkataramanachar~~ Doddagelli Panchamukhi Anjaneyaswami at Doddapet (Managers protem) /Insd/ J. P. Grant Supt			

(16)

Division

GPB—50—9-5-08

LENGTH OF POSSESSION

Abstract of the orders already issued by the Commissioner or the Superintendent of the Division on lapses regarding validity or excess of the Inam. Assistant's opinion and recommendation	Review by the Special Assistant and confirmation by the Inam Commissioner
19	20
1. Whole grant Personal Jari. 2. Disposed of as per Register No. II. 3. To be confirmed on 1/8 Quit Rent or annas 12. 4. Huzur Jari account 1831 adopted. /Signed/ B. Rajagopaliah 23-1-80. Counter /Signed/ Robt. Cole Supt. 19-7-80	x x 5. Vide Government Proceedings No. 3430-1 dated 2nd May 1904 directing that the name of the Deity "Panchamukhi Anjaneya Swami" be entered instead of Pujari. /Signed/ J. P. Grant Superintendent 10-6-1904.

"Copy"

D. Rama Rao

Superintendent of Inam Settlements in Mysore

Compd. ✠

Inam Superintendent's office.

Bangalore dated 16th August 1909.

G.R.S. 26] 9.8.09

117

File No. 236-

Serial No

Diary No. of letter replied to — — —

2465

No. 531 encl 1 file

Mysore F. 236-08-09.

General and Rev. Secretariat

( )

, *the* 190 .

To

The Dy Commr,

Mysore Dist

Date of issue 19th August 1909

Signed by M. N. S. Aiyer

Sir,

With reference to your letter no 49 dated 29th July 1909 submitting further report in connection with the suit filed by Kannambadi Srinivasa Iyengar against the Amildar of the Bhamarajnagar Taluk, I am directed to request you to move the District Judge for a further adjournment of one month and submit information on the points noted below:—

1) whether in view of the fact that so far back as 1880 the Govt

over.

SUBJECT.

—at the Inam Settlement and enfranchised treated as Personal Inam, Govt. &

~~should now plead before a~~

~~Civil Court~~ who have the

power to rectify any mistake

that might have been committed

by the Inam Commissioner

should ~~plead~~ urge in a Civil

Court that the Inam Settle-

ment in this case was wrong, and

2) whether in view of the fact,

that the Amildar of Chamara-

nagar is only a pro-forma

Defendant and relief is only

sought against the other

Defendants, it is necessary

to defend this suit at

Govt. cost.

2) With reference to Para 2

of the letter under reply,

stating that the written

Statement proposed to be filed

has to be drawn up by the

Advocate to be engaged

am to observe that —

List of enclosures.

Copied by

Examined by

MGCPD—20,000-19-12—04.

(19

G.R.S. 27]

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

(*Continuation Sheet draft form.*)

Mr. Sundararajiengar who was Amildar, took the initiative in the matter and is now the Assistant Commr. in charge of the Sub. division, may be called upon to justify his action and suggest the line of defence to be adopted

3) The enclosures to the letter under reply are herewith returned for reference and re-submission within 10 days.

I have etc.

11/8/1917

for Secretary

18/8/17

19 7 09

Muz. 1]

190

From

To

The Collector of Inam Settlement in Mysore

Dated

Despatched

Received

General No.

No.

Enclosure No.

Adverting to his letter No. 17 dated 4th August 1909 forwarding an extract of the Inam register relating to the grant of Inam in respect Village Channarayapatna Taluk to Venkatachariar Archak of the Panchamukhi Anjaneya Swamy Temple in Doddapet, Mysore has the honor to enquire under what circum-

stances

the lands which appear to have been Devadaya Inam granted for the support of the Temple, were, at the Inam settlement, treated as personal.

By order,
(Sd) [illegible]
11/8/1897
for Secretary.

18/8/97

D 479

Hur 2316 —

From The Superintendent of Settlements in

To The Secretary to the Govern-ment of H.H the Mysore, General and

Dated 27th
Despatched 28th } August 19 D
Received

General No. 23
No.

Enclosure No.

States that the lands grant for the support of the Panch-mukhi Anjaneyaswami temple in Doddapet, Mysore city, made "Devadaya under authority of Government-P No. 3430-1 dated 2nd May,

Refer Ad. Contingent 92

10/9/09

GPB—2,00,000—12-4-09

Inam Superintendents' Office

No. 23. Dated, Bangalore 27th/28th August 1909.

From

The Superintendent of Inam
Settlements in Mysore

To

The Secretary to the Government
of H.H the Maharaja of Mysore,
General and Revenue
Departments.

Sir,

With reference to your docket no: 532 / Muzf. no. 236-08-6
dated 19th August 1909, enquiring the circumstances under which the lands which appear to have been Devadaya Inam granted for the support of the Panchamukhi Anjaneya swami temple in Doddapet, Mysore City, were treated as personal at the Inam Settlement, I have the honor to state that from Col: 14 of the Inam Register, it will be seen that the Inam appeared

in

24

in the old accounts of 1831 - 1832 and 1855 in the name of Archak Narasimha- - char. The Amildar sent in a State- - ment of Inams 1879 for the Inam — Settlement in which also the Inam is treated as "Personal". It was accordingly settled as "personal" at the Inam — Settlement. Subsequently on a — representation from the Deputy Commissioner the Inam was made "Devadaya" in the name of the temple under the authority of Government Pro. No 3430 - I dated 2nd May 1904.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient
Servant

D. Rama Rao
Superintendent of Inam
Settlements in Mysore

D 595 1910 (25)

190

From M.F. 236-08-9
K. Chandy Esq B.A.
Offg: Deputy Commissioner
Mysore District

To
K. S. Chandrasekhara Iyer Esq B.A. B.L.
Secy: to Government
Judicial Branch

Dated 3-9-09

Despatched

Received

General No. 112

No.

Enclosure No. 16 file

Submits further report re suit filed by Kannambadi Srinivasiengar against the Amildar of Chamarajnagar Taluk

Refer cons
XX
Communicate.
by

261

No. 112
Enc. No. 16th

OFFICE OF THE Deputy Commissioner
MYSORE DISTRICT,
Dated Mysore Camp 3rd Sept 1909.

To
K. S. Chendrasekhara Iyer Esq., B.A. B.L.
SECRETARY TO THE GOVERNMENT
OF HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE,
GENERAL AND REVENUE DEPARTMENTS.
Mugrai Branch.

Sir,

Adverting to your letter No 5531 Mug 7 236-08-7 dated 19th August 1909, I have the honor to state that the District judge, Mysore division, has been requested to grant a further adjournment of one month.

The Sub Divisional officer's official memorandum No 49 dated 26.8.09 and the English memo prepared by him with reference to this office memo calling upon him to justify his action and suggest the line of defence to be adopted are herewith submitted.

From the final Title Deed dated

(27 T

dated 31st January 1898 filed
with the accompanying re-
cords it will be seen that the
lands in question have been
treated as Brahmadaya and
personal and Kannambadi
Srinivasiengar exchanged the
shops for these lands on the
ground that they were perso-
nal enfranchised Inam so
far back as in 1895.

In 1904 i.e. 6 years after the
date of issue of the final title
deed, Government ordered the
alienation into devadaya.

The lands being personal
Brahmadaya enfranchised
Inam the Archak had,
a right to alienate them and
I am doubtful whether the
civil Court would treat the
lands as devadaya and wh-
there would be any use in
defending the suit at Govern-
ment

ment cost.

If, however, Government directs that the case may be defended, sanction may be accorded to engage an Advocate.

The enclosures received with the letter under reply are herewith returned

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
your most obedient
servant

K Macaulay

Offg Deputy Commr
Mysore District

B.a

G.R.S. 20]

29

Dft as per notes

File No.

Serial No.

Diary No. of letter replied to

No. 903 and 1 file
M. 7. 236-08-10

General and Revenue Secretariat
( )
, *the* 190

To

The Hy Commr
Bangalore Cantt

Date of issue 25th September 09

Signed by Mr. A. S. Iyer

Sir,

I have the honour to acknowledge with your letter No 112 dated 3rd September 1909 ~~forwarding~~ on the matter of opening the Cart path by one Ramanna to Srinivasaiengar's ~~land~~ in possession of a portion of S No 418 of Omkal Village Channapatna Taluk I am directed to say that ~~as~~ it appears that the Mess while it owned the land had no right of way over the land in question and cannot claim

[illegible]
14/9/09
Under Secy.
Under 9/09

SUBJECT.

List of enclosures,

Copied by

Examined by

GPB—10,000—23-5-08

D 661 (30)

~~1909~~ 1910.

F.F- 236-08-11

From

K. Chandy Esqr B.A.
Offg Deputy Commissioner
Bangalore District

To

K S Chandrasekhara Aiyar Esq B.A. B.L.
Secy: to Govt Judicial Branch

Dated 24-9-09.

Despatched 26

Received

General No. 125

No.

Enclosure No.

Solicits orders in the matter of engaging an advocate to defend the suit filed by Kannam-badi Srinivasa Iyengar

Refer AG
orders have been passed.
Refer Dr to Govt. ?
[illegible]
22/9/09
AG

311

No. 125
Enc. No.

OFFICE OF THE Deputy Commr.

MYSORE DISTRICT.

Dated Mysore Camp 24th September 1909.
26

To
K. S. Chendrasekhara Iyer Esq., B.A. B.L.

SECRETARY TO THE GOVERNMENT
OF HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE,
GENERAL AND REVENUE DEPARTMENTS.
Inamgai Branch

Sir,

In continuation of this office letter No. 112 dated 3/4 th September 1909 236-08 submitting further report in connection with the suit filed by Kamanabadi Srinivasiengar against the Amildar of the Chamarajnagar Taluk, I have the honor to state that the District Judge Mysore Division, has replied in his docket No 852/260 dated the 15/16 th September 1909 that the case has been adjourned once for all to 20th October 1909 and that the motion for adjournment should have been made through the Advocate appearing for Government

ment in the case.

Early orders are therefore solicited in the matter of engaging an advocate if the case is to be defended by Government.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
your most obedient
servant

K. Mundy

Offg Deputy Commissioner
Bd Surpore District